

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,996	1,996 07/03/2003		Chan-Tung Chen	CHEN3560/EM	3393
23364	7590	12/16/2003		EXAMINER	
BACON & 625 SLATE			SHEEHAN, JOHN P		
FOURTH FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				1742	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/611,996	CHEN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John P. Sheehan	1742					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute,  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  /s will be considered timely.  I the mailing date of this communication.  FD (35 U.S.C. & 133)					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<b></b> •						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.  37 CFR 1.78.  a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.							
Attachment(s)							
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/611,996

Art Unit: 1742

V .. ~

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yabuki et al. (Yabuki, Japanese Patent Document No, 59-70744).

Yabuki teaches an alloy composition comprising, in weight percent,

C 2 to 3%.

Cr 10 to 28%,

Fe 1 to 30%.

W 0.1 to 17%,

Mo 0.1 to 8.0%,

Ti 0.01 to 4.5%,

Al 0.01 to 4.5%, and

Ni the balance along with inevitable impurities (see the English language abstract).

Yabuki's alloy overlaps the alloy composition recited in applicants' claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/611,996

Art Unit: 1742

Yabuki and the claims differ in that Yabuki does not teach the exact same proportions as recited in the instant claims, does not teach "a weight member for a golf club head" and is silent with respect to "precision casting".

However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have considered the invention to have been obvious because the alloy proportions taught by Yabuki overlap the instantly claimed proportions and therefore are considered to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, in that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select any portion of the disclosed ranges including the instantly claimed ranges, from the ranges disclosed in the prior art reference, In re Peterson 65 USPQ2d 1379 (CAFC 2003, In re Geisler 43 USPQ2d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 1997); <u>In re Woodruff,</u> 16 USPQ2d 1934 (CCPA 1976); In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549. 553 (CCPA 1974) and MPEP 2144.05. It is the Examiner's position that the claim limitation "weight member for a golf club head" is not clearly defined in the specification. In view of this, the term, "weight member for a golf club head" does not limit the claim to any particular structure that distinguishes the claimed invention from the alloy in any cast form. Regarding "precision casting" it is the Examiner's position that this language is a process limitation in a product claim, thus applicants' claims are product by process claims. The process limitations recited in the instant product by process claims do not necessarily lend patentability to the claimed product, MPEP 2113.

## Page 4

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Sheehan whose telephone number is (703) 308-3861. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (6:45-4:30) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (703) 308-1146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

John P. Sheehan Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1742

jps